Appl. No. 10/697,131

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the outstanding rejection under 35 USC 112. Claim 1 has not been narrowed in scope by this amendment.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Dalmia. In light of the following remarks the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner relies upon FIG. 4 of Dalmia. In FIG. 4, element 102 is a phase detector. However, element 104 is a **frequency detector**. Thus, Dalmia fails to disclose a first and second phase detector (or the detection of first and second phase differences) as required by claims 1, 3, 5, and 8.

Functionally, Dalmia sets forth circuitry for the recovery of a clock signal from a, presumably, combined clock/data signal, while the present invention is directed toward the modification of a clock signal at the transmission end such that the clock signal arrives in the correct phase at the receiving end of the transmission line.

Referring to the claims, the presently rejected claims require the comparison of two **clock** signals, Dalmia compares a data signal with an internally generated (by the VCO 110) clock signal. There is no indication that the data signal is in fact a clock signal (although it may have an embedded clock signal). Looking at column 3 lines 25-26, the received clock signal (RECVD_CLK)output by the VCO 110 is a recovered clock signal, e.g. generated based on the data signal. Even if the embedded clock signal is considered as the clock signal there is no corresponding "returned clock signal."

In claim 3, a "return line matched to the transmission line" is recited. This means that the return line is "geometrically matched" to the transmission line, e.g. they both have the same length. This is not even mentioned in Dalmia.

Claims 5 sets forth "... driving a voltage controlled oscillator using the average of the first and second phase differences." Dalmia teaches the use of an OR gate 106 connecting the output of the phase detector 104 and the frequency detector 104. Nothing is mentioned about averaging the two outputs.

8

Appl. No. 10/697,131

For at least these reasons, Dalmia does not anticipate claims 1, 3, 5 and 8 for failing disclose at least: two phase detectors (claims 1, 3, 5, and 8); a matched return line (claim 3); and using the average of the phase differences (claim 5). Accordingly withdrawal of the subject rejection under 35 USC 102 is requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of Dalmia and Hill et al. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 (and in turn claim 1) discussed hereinabove. Nothing in Hill et al. addresses the defects noted in Dalmia noted herein above. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 cannot stand and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, such action being earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining informalities to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such informalities.

9

Appl. No. 10/697,131

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES

Date: July 13, 2004   By:
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES   Gerald P. Joyce III
Legal Department, DL 429   Registration No. 37,648
Intellectual Property Administration   (978) 681-2405
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile
Transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office of the date
Shown below.

Date of facsimile: July 13, 2004

Typed Name: Gerald P. Joyce III

Signature:

10